1		Honorable Marshall Ferguson Noted for Hearing: November 26, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.
2	SC	UXASJAFIKI AD With Oral Argument PÕÂÔUWÞVŸ
3	ÙWÚÒÜŒ	DJÜÁÔUWÜVÁÔŠÒÜS ÒĒZOŠOÖ
4	ÔŒÙÒÂÌ	ÁFJËÐÏHEFÏ FÉÍ ÁÙÒŒ
5		
6		
7		
8		RT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THE COUNTY OF KING
9)
10	GARFIELD COUNTY	CASE NO. 19-2-30171-6 SEA
11	TRANSPORTION AUTHORITY; KING COUNTY; CITY OF SEATTLE;)
12	WASHINGTON STATE TRANSIT ASSOCIATION; ASSOCIATION OF	DECLARATION OF TIM EYMAN
13	WASHINGTON CITIES; PORT OF	
14	SEATTLE; INTERCITY TRANSIT; AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION))
15	LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF WASHINGTON, and MICHAEL)
16	ROGERS;)
17	Plaintiffs,))
18	v.)
19)
20	STATE OF WASHINGTON,)
21	Defendant.)
22	I, Tim Eyman, being over 18 years of	d and legally competent to testify to the matters set
23	forth herein, with personal knowledge of the	same, now on oath, and subject to the laws of perjury in
24	the state of Washington as enforced in King	
25	the state of washington as emoteed in King	County, now deciate as follows.
26		

DECLARATION OF TIM EYMAN

1	1.	I am one of the co-sponsors of Initiative Measure No. 976.
2	2.	I filed the initiative on March 19, 2018, with the Secretary of State. The ballot title
3	and ballot summary for the Initiative were written by the Attorney General and issued on March 26,	
4	2018.	
5	3.	I filed a ballot title challenge to the initiative on April 2, 2019. A hearing was set on
6	April 18, 2018, but the day before the hearing, a motion to dismiss the challenge was filed. The court	
7	signed an order dismissing the action on April 18, 2018.	
9	4.	Thereafter, a signature drive was initiated, and 352,093 voter signatures were
10	obtained and submitted to the Secretary of State on January 3, 2019.	
11	5.	On January 15, 2019, I-976 was certified by the Secretary of State.
12	6.	As of November 21, 2019, the number of voters in Washington who voted in favor of
13		
14	the Initiative were One Million Fifty-two Thousand Three Hundred and Six (1,052,306) votes yes	
15	and Nine Hundred Thirty-Four Thousand Two Hundred and Forty-Five (934,245) of voters in	
16	Washington voted against the measure, and the measure passed by 52.97% to 47.03% margin.	
17	7.	Outside of King County, non-King County residents approved the measure by 59%,
18	(797,021) while King County voted 59% against.	
19	8.	In a recent communication with Noah Purcell, the Solicitor General representing the
20	defendant in	this case on behalf of the State of Washington, disclosed to me that the Attorney
21	General's office will not be seeking a change in venue despite the fact that one of the Plaintiff's in	
22 23	the case is King County which employs the judge. How can a judge who's paid by one of the	
24	plaintiffs be seen as unbiased? Any King County Superior Court judge will be wrestling with the	
25	conflict between limiting tax revenue to his employer by upholding I-976 because doing so puts his	
26	own payched	ck at risk. Even if assigned to another King County judge, the appearance of bias is TION OF TIM EYMAN

1	undeniable (Solicitor General Purcell also confirmed that the Attorney General's office would not
2	file an affidavit of prejudice against the judge).
3	9. The conflicts argument also applies to Garfield County, another one of the plaintiffs
4	Fortunately, there are 37 other counties that can serve as potential venues to hear the matter.
5	Signed in Bellevue, Washington this 22 nd day of November 2019
6	
7	
8	Tim Eyman
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	